

Application Serial No. 10/032,843

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's findings, conclusions, and for pointing out the allowance of Claims 20-33.

5

2. The Applicant cancels Claims 1-19, 34-43, and 46-60 from the application. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to cancel Claims 1-19, 34-43, and 46-60 solely for the purpose of expediting the patent process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making such
10 amendments, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which the Applicant considers the invention herein entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

15

3. Claims 1, 2, 6-14, 16, 18, 19, 34-38, 40-43, 46-55, 57, 59, and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,128,624 (hereinafter "Papierniak") in view of U.S. patent no. 6,430,539 (hereinafter "Lazarus").

20

In view of the above described cancellation of Claims 1, 2, 6-14, 16, 18, 19, 34-38, 40-43, 46-55, 57, 59, and 60, the current rejection of Claims 1, 2, 6-14, 16, 18, 19, 34-38, 40-43, 46-55, 57, 59, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak in view of Lazarus is rendered moot.

25

4. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak in view of Lazarus in further view of U.S. patent application no. US 20020067821 (hereinafter "Benson").

Application Serial No. 10/032,843

In view of the above described cancellation of Claim 3, the current rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak in view of Lazarus in further view of Benson is rendered moot.

- 5 5. Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak in view of Lazarus in further view of U.S. patent no. 6,048,271 (hereinafter "Barcelou").

10 In view of the above described cancellation of Claims 4 and 5, the current rejection of Claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak in view of Lazarus in further view of Barcelou is rendered moot.

- 15 6. Claims 15, 17, 39, and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak in view of Lazarus in further view of U.S. patent no. 6,470,307 (hereinafter "Turney").

20 The Applicant notes that Claim 58 was not formally rejected. However, the Applicant proceeds as if Claim 58 was rejected in this section as the Examiner's comments refer to Claim 58 in this section. Immediate notification and correction is requested of the Examiner if this assumption is incorrect.

25 In view of the above described cancellation of Claims 15, 17, 39, 56, and 58, the current rejection of Claims 15, 17, 39, 56, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak in view of Lazarus in further view of Turney is rendered moot.

- 30 7. The Examiner objects to Claim 20 noting that the claim identifier of "Currently Amended" is not appropriate as Claim 20 was not amended. Hence, the Applicant changes the claim identifier of Claim 20 to "Original". Accordingly, the current objection to Claim 20 is deemed to be overcome.


OCT 25 2007

Application Serial No. 10/032,843

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, the Application is deemed to be in allowable condition. The Examiner is therefore earnestly requested to withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections, allowing the Application to pass to issue as a United States Patent. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's attorney at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael A. Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862